EXHIBIT A

Pages 1 - 94

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Before the Honorable William H. Alsup, Judge

WAYMO LLC,

No. C 17-0939 WHA

Plaintiff,

VS.

BOUND SEPARATELY
PAGES 95 - 145 (UNDER SEAL)

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;
OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING

Defendants.

San Francisco, California Wednesday, September 20, 2017

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff:

QUINN, EMANUEL, URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP 50 California Street, 22nd Floor San Francisco, California 94111

BY: CHARLES K. VERHOEVEN, ATTORNEY AT LAW
JORDAN R. JAFFE, ATTORNEY AT LAW
MELISSA J. BAILY, ATTORNEY AT LAW
DAVID ANDREW PERLSON, ATTORNEY AT LAW
JEFFREY W. NARDINELLI, ATTORNEY AT LAW
FELIPE CORREDOR, ATTORNEY AT LAW

QUINN, EMANUEL, URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP 51 Madison Avenue

New York, New York 10010

BY: JAMES E. BAKER, ATTORNEY AT LAW

(Appearances continued on next page)

Reported By: Katherine Powell Sullivan, CSR No. 5812, RMR, CRR

Jo Ann Bryce, CSR No. 3321, RMR, CRR, FCRR

Official Reporters

2.2

And I don't mean to sound technical, but this is very important. There is no evidence that he actually downloaded anything onto that device. It's very important.

All they've been able to prove is that some device was plugged into his computer. That's the distinction that I'm trying to draw. So I don't want to make a concession here that's inaccurate.

If you want to talk about inferences, we can talk about inferences. But they have not been able to prove that anything was actually downloaded onto that device.

And that's why I'm saying to you, it would have been important for you, as the judge, to know at the preliminary injunction stage that actually downloading Tortoise is not suspicious at all. It's instruction number one of the document that I just showed you.

And downloading 14,000 files, which they pointed out to you how many gigabytes that was, it would have been appropriate, I think, for them to tell you, and, by the way, if you follow instruction number three on the paper I just handed you, that is precisely what would happen. And --

MR. VERHOEVEN: May I respond?

THE COURT: Does the A team come forward?

MR. VERHOEVEN: No, no. This is transitioning from the technical to whether this means anything. And I'd like --

THE COURT: What do you say in response to what I just

heard? 1 2 MR. VERHOEVEN: Well, we, last Thursday, received the Stroz report. And at page 12 it talks about evidence on 3 Levandowski's personal laptop, of 24,000 files in a folder 4 5 called "Chauffeur SVN." 6 And just --MR. GONZÁLEZ: Your Honor --7 This is something they have designated 8 MR. VERHOEVEN: confidential, Your Honor. 9 MR. GONZÁLEZ: I would be happy to respond, but I 10 believe there's an issue and motions for protective order 11 pending, that have been filed by other defendants, with respect 12 to the substance of the report. 13 14 I will say one thing --I have said in an order, I thought, -- has 15 that order gone out? -- that we can't go through life in this 16 17 case on saying that anything that's in the due diligence report is confidential. So when we have the trial, it's going to be 18 public. Period. 19 20 Now, I am going to say that you ought to keep it, quote, at the low-level confidential, among yourselves, and not give 21 it to the New York Times and everybody else, at that low level. 2.2 But when we come to court, we're going to talk openly. 23 This court belongs to the public. It does not belong to you 24 25 lawyers or you parties. And there's nothing in that due

diligence report, in my view, that is any worse than the stuff 1 2 that's already come out. So I'm going to just say you can -- I think I know what 3 4 you were about to say. And you go ahead and say it. 5 MR. VERHOEVEN: So this is actually information we 6 learned and put together last night. So -- but on last Thursday, we saw the Stroz report. 7 8 page 12 it said that there were 24,000 files in 9 Mr. Levandowski's personal device. It also said that they were deleted on December 14th. 10 Now, Your Honor, probably doesn't recall the specifics, 11 12 but if you match that up against Google's -- or Waymo's analysis of what happened with Levandowski's Google laptop, the 13 14 evidence shows he downloaded 14,000 files from the SVN server 15 on December 11th. And on December 14th, same day as these 24,000 files were deleted, he put in the card reader, for eight 16 17 hours, in his Google Waymo laptop and then, we think, copied all of those files. 18 The very same day we have here a statement by Stroz that 19 20 24,000 files from the same SVN server were deleted off his personal computer. 21 2.2 Well, last night we finally got an identification of what those 24,000 files were. And there's a chunk that's nonsense. 23 24 But of the 14,000 files that we identified at the beginning of 25 this case, all but seven are in that 24,000 that were deleted.

If they were deleted, how do you know what 1 THE COURT: 2 they were? 3 MR. VERHOEVEN: Because Stroz can give us the identification of the file names. And that's what we got. 4 So through forensic analysis, we know now that there's an 5 6 overlap of all but seven files between what Levandowski copied off his card reader on the 14th of December, put onto his 7 personal laptop on the 14th of December, and then deleted off 8 9 of his personal laptop. Your Honor, this is one example of why we need a 10 continuance. We need to follow this trail. 11 12 THE COURT: No. Stop on that right now. See, you're sliding off on to something else. 13 14 MR. VERHOEVEN: Sorry. THE COURT: I'm trying to understand the download 15 point first. 16 17 MR. VERHOEVEN: Just to finish off, we haven't had the opportunity yet to -- although we'll get to it soon -- to 18 19 examine forensically this laptop on which the 14,000 files were 20 deleted. There could very well be evidence that he copied those --21 2.2 **THE COURT:** Well, where is that laptop now? It's at Stroz. 23 MR. VERHOEVEN: THE COURT: You mean the Levandowski personal laptop 24 25 is at Stroz?